REMARKS

In the Office Action dated August 10, 2005, claims 1-4, 7, 9, 11, and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over U.S. Patent No. 6,711,182 (Gibbs); claims 2, 5, and 10 were rejected under § 103 over Gibbs; and claims 8 and 13 were objected to.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 4 and 9 to correct a translation typographical error. No new matter has been added.

The Applicant responds to the Examiner's Office Action and respectfully requests the Examiner place all pending claims detailed in the application in a state of allowance.

A.   Prior Art Rejections (35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 7, 9, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,711,182 to Gibbs et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Gibbs"). Applicant submits, however, that Gibbs does not describe or suggest a method or device for forming transport frames by calculating a respective error detection code for a subset of bits, placing the subset of bits in a respective transport frame with the error detection code, with the transport frames containing subsets of bits from different frames and accompanied by the respective error detection codes.

Rather, Gibbs discloses transmission of data from several data sources where data from each source is assigned different priorities or classes (Gibbs, Fig. 1). The data output from each source (logical channel) is then multiplexed and divided into frames in preparation for transmission. The classes from all the different logical channels are arranged into a priority order using a mapping scheme, as illustrated in FIGs. 3A and 3B of Gibbs. In this mapping scheme, it is clearly shown that it only calculates a corresponding CRC code for one source, for example, video channel. In other words, although there are more than one class per source such as video or audio channel, only one corresponding CRC for all the classes is used (see also, Gibbs, Figs. 3A and 3B):

> In the case shown, the ordering within the data structure is a simple shuffling of the various classes. In this example the CRC bits for each channel have been appended to the left edge of the data of the highest class of that channel. So the CRC bits of the video channel are appended to the class 3 bits of that channel. Except for this combination containing the CRC bits, in the example

of FIG. 3A the left edge of each class defines which class obtains greater priority between different channels. (Gibbs, col. 6, lines 40-48, emphasis added)

Therefore, Gibbs discloses only one CRC code corresponding to all the classes of a given logical channel or source.

However, Applicant's claim 1 recites calculating respective error detection codes for at least one subset of bits included in the set of bits of the frame. In Applicant's claim, error detection code is calculated for respective K number of subsets, using K respective error detection codes. Therefore, for example, according to some embodiments, K respective CRC codes are calculated for K respective subsets, as opposed to only one corresponding CRC being calculated for all the classes. Gibbs, thus, simply does not teach or suggest respective error detection codes.

The Examiner also rejected claims 2, 5, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Gibbs in view of claims 1, 4 and 9.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's arguments.

As stated in §2143 of the MPEP:

> To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the reference themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art references (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

> The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in the applicant's disclosure. §2143, MPEP Rev. 2.0, May 2004, pg. 2100-129.

As acknowledged by the Examiner, Gibbs does not disclose that the number of bits of the error detection code calculated for a subset of bits is an increasing function of the number of bits of the subset. Rather, the Examiner cites Gibbs as applied to claims 1, 4, and 9 as disclosing this feature and concludes that that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine Gibbs as applied to claims 1, 4, and 9 to arrive at Applicant's claims 2, 5, and 10.

Applicant submits that the dependent claims 2, 5, and 10 each include, by way of their dependencies, *inter alia*, the limitation that a method or device comprise "calculating a respective error detection code for said at least one subset of bits" or "...extracting from each

transport frame at least one of said subsets of bits, along with a respective error detection code."
As stated above, to establish a *prima facie* obviousness rejection, the Examiner's cited art must
teach or suggest all claim limitations.

However, Gibbs, either alone or in combination with any other art, does not describe or
suggest a method or device for calculating a respective error detection code for the subsets of bits
where the number of bits of the error correction code is of an increasing function of the number
of bits of the subset. Simply put, there is no such teaching or suggestion in Gibbs.

Therefore, Gibbs fails to teach or suggest the aforementioned features recited in
Applicant's claims. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

For all the foregoing reasons, allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested.
The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees and/or credit any overpayment to
Deposit Account No. 20-1504 (MTR.0032US).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Jan 10, 2006

Dan C. Hu
Registration No. 40,025
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, TX 77024
Telephone: (713) 468-8880
Facsimile: (713) 468-8883